

# WASHINGTON SENTINEL.

VOL. XXVIII.

WASHINGTON CITY, D. C., SATURDAY APRIL 27, 1901

NO 43

Washington Sentinel,  
Published and Edited by  
**LOUIS SCHADE.**  
APPEARS EVERY SATURDAY.



TERMS  
\$3 per year for single copy sent by  
mail to subscribers, payable in advance.

ADVERTISING  
First insertion, one inch, \$1.50; second  
insertion, 75 cents; Liberal reductions  
for annual advertisements. Special  
notices 25 cents a line.  
Advertisements to insure insertion  
should be handed in not later than 12  
o'clock noon on Thursday.  
Office: No. 600 F Street, N. W.,  
Washington, D. C.  
Sample copies mailed upon applica-  
tion. Address LOUIS SCHADE, Wash-  
ington, D. C.

## NEUTRALITY LAWS

The "Evening Star" Comes to the  
President's Aid.

The article in last week's *SENTINEL* commenting unfavorably on the Administration's failure to enforce neutrality regarding the sale and shipment of supplies for the British army in South Africa has spurred Mr. McKinley's Washington organ, the *Evening Star*, to an effort to lessen the odium attaching to the President for his neglect of a plain duty. The organ says upon the purchase of \$50,000,000 of England's new loan by American capitalists as a vindication of the President's course. It says:

SULZERISM AND THE WAR LOAN.

It is but fair to assume that the Hon. Wm. Sulzer and those who take their readings of international law from him are following closely the details of the floating of the new British war loan. There is a very plain text in the matter from their viewpoint for another howl about the violation of neutrality obligations. The bidding has been lively. The loan, indeed, will be a big success. Investors everywhere have shown an eagerness for paper which has so much security behind it. Americans have been allotted a large block, and the cabalists that "applications on French account" were considerable.

Applications from France for part of this loan? Isn't France neutral as between the British and the Boers? But if her people were in position openly to take sides would they not take the side of the Boers? Wasn't the reception accorded by them to Mr. Kruger of the most enthusiastic description? What sort of talk is this, therefore, about "applications on French account" for part of this loan, when the money is to be expended by Great Britain in further operations against the Boers? Is that neutrality? On the contrary, is it not openly aiding and abetting Great Britain? Is not, indeed, money in such circumstances and for such purposes contraband of war?

And what right has even Pierpont Morgan, who seems to be so heavily loaded with money that he is able to take a flyer in everything, to go to the aid of Great Britain in this way? The temptation from the purely sordid viewpoint is, we may admit, very strong. But should he be permitted to embrace it? Does not the United States pretend to be neutral as between the British and the Boers? And shall any citizen of this country, simply for the purpose of forwarding his own personal fortunes, lend money to Great Britain to finish up her very difficult job in South Africa? The decision of Judge Parlane at New Orleans in the mule case would appear to cover the point and to permit the investment, but that has been received with such disfavor by the Sulzerites it may be advisable to go into the whole question again.

Money is everything to Great Britain at this time. It will buy mules, ammunition, rifles, cannon, foodstuffs; will pay off men already in her service, and induce others to enlist. Stop her supplies, and you paralyze her fighting arm. Help increase them, and you strengthen her for what is still before her in South Africa. Should capitalists in any neutral country therefore be permitted to take her paper and refill her strong box? To repeat the question, is not money in such a case contraband of war? One could wish to hear Mr. Sulzer argue this point somewhere before a full bench.

The "very pat text" furnished by the success of the new British war loan is but proof of the cordial sympathy existing between the money powers and the Administration. The floating of the loan gave the former an opportunity, by subscribing to a part of it, to demonstrate to England that the howl over the shipment of mules did not come from the Administration's ranks. It was not necessary that such an extreme step, which involves a financial loss to our investors, should have been taken to prove Republican sympathy for England in her present embarrassments. It was well known on which side the Administration stood.

From the beginning of the war the desire of our Government to further English aims has been so disgustingly exhibited in this unholy strife that such a staunch advocate of Mr. McKinley's first election as Hon. Webster Davis resigned his office in disapproval of

it. Mr. McKinley's reception of the Boer delegates, whom he invited to view the beautiful Potomac from the rear of the White House much in the same way as the late Senator Mahone received his colored constituents at his back door—was ample proof of his feelings in the matter. Young Mr. Hay's visit to Downing street on his way to Pretoria as representative of this Government will be recalled as another evidence of friendly interest in England's behalf. It was entirely unnecessary that our investors should be asked to accept English consols which yield only 2.81 per cent when so much better interest can be obtained at home. If an explanation is wanted for the allotment of \$50,000,000 to America, it may be found in the following from the *New York World*:

Great moneyed interests in America represented by J. P. Morgan are desirous of being upon friendly terms with the British Government and British investors.

If for "moneyed interests" you substitute the "Republican Administration" you will have the secret of Mr. Morgan's concern for the success of the English loan.

The *Star* waxes sarcastic in referring to the fact that "applications on French account were considerable." Granting that this is true, what does it prove? Simply that French moneyed men, like their prototypes in all stages of the world's history and everywhere, have been willing to barter honor and principle for gold and in pursuit of the mighty dollar "have shown an eagerness for paper which has so much security behind it." The difference between ruling rates of interest in France and those offered by their English neighbors were so great that French speculators forgot (if they ever cared to remember) the purpose for which the loan was required and that its payment would be enforced in the sweat and blood of their South African brothers.

It will be confessed, however, that French bidders for English bonds no more represented French opinion in the Boer-British conflict than do Mr. Morgan and his friends the opinions of those who extended such a hearty welcome to the Boer envoys in this country. Further, the strained relations and undisguised dislike of each other which exist between France and England, which found expression in a Franco Russian alliance as a challenge to Great Britain as well as to Germany, forbid the assumption that the act of French money lenders in any way indicated French feeling or course of action in the improbable event of an opportunity to take sides in the Boer cause.

France is neutral, but if occasion arose her people would be found championing the cause of the Boers. Of that there is as little doubt as that Americans—aside from the money kings—would be found on the same side under favoring conditions. The severest reverses English arms met in the early stages of the war in the Transvaal were administered under the direction of a distinguished French officer whose early death was the heaviest blow the cause of the republics received. And when President Kruger landed in Europe the doors of France were open to him in sympathy with his mission as well as in rebuke of England's course. The time has not yet come in the history of France any more than in the history of our own country when it can be said that the owners of wealth speak for the mass of the people, act for them, and reflect their opinions and wishes.

Now as to the bearing of this bond purchase upon the question of neutrality, *The Star's* article asks: "Is not, indeed, money in such circumstances and for such purposes contraband of war?"

Well, we had a little disagreement ourselves some forty years ago in the course of which England, whom our financiers are now in gratitude helping out of a hole, took up some bonds of the seceding States and in return furnished money and supplies for the Confederacy. Could the United States have put its hand upon cash or bonds, would those articles be considered contraband of war? We have an idea that they would be confiscated as quickly as would have been the supplies they were intended to purchase. If the sale of mules to England now is merely a commercial matter, why is such a hullabaloo made by the North over a similar transaction between England and the South? We should have been as willing to concede trade rights to England

then as we are to demand them for ourselves today.

If furnishing war supplies to belligerents is such a small matter where our great friend England is concerned, why is so much ado raised over the sale of similar articles to the Filipinos? If we have mules to sell, have we not also firearms to sell? If it is only a matter of trade in one case, why not in the other? Is it because the little peoples have no rights powerful nations are bound to respect?

In some quarters—notably in the case of our English ally of today—an impression once prevailed that the North would sooner or later be relegated to the ranks of the smaller powers, and this impression led her to wink sometimes and again to openly countenance evasions of neutrality laws for which she paid—not, however, as dearly as she should—under the Geneva award. It is our fond hope—though seemingly a hopeless one—that the South African Republics may emerge victorious from their struggles, as did our own republic, to demand the same reparation from the United States that we demanded and obtained from England.

Meantime we can assure our evening contemporary that Hon. Wm. Sulzer and those who read international law like him are closely following the details of the floating of the new English war loan merely, as a matter of curiosity, to learn if the Hon. Wm. McKinley's name figures among the favored bidders.

We are also following the appeal of Gen. Pearson, in the name of the Orange Republic, to President McKinley to stop the sale of mules to England, which, Judge Parlane said, was a matter for the Executive and not for the courts. We will be glad to record a favorable answer to this appeal, but we have no idea that it will ever be our good fortune to do so.

And perhaps the *Star* will have an opportunity to hear Mr. Sulzer discuss the question as to whether money is or is not contraband of war in the next Congress. If he does we can assure our neighbor an interesting chat. Mr. Sulzer is not a humorist—it would not do to have two of a kind in Washington at the same time—but he has a way of saying things, and when he has spoken the Apologist for the Administration will know it has been in an argument.

### Unselfish Altruism.

The London *Spectator* calls American opposition to European colonization schemes in South America "a dog-in-the-manger" policy. This rebuke of American selfishness comes with admirable grace from an English newspaper. Everybody knows how unselfish Great Britain is in such matters. All the nations of the world are at liberty to establish colonies in India and to take large slices of Indian territory. If the United States wished to settle a few hundred thousand Americans in South Africa with the object of acquiring possession of Natal or the Transvaal gold mines Uncle Sam would receive hearty encouragement in London. If Germany should ask for a slice of Egypt no objection would be made by the Government of King Edward. Everybody understands how liberal the British is in these matters, how absolutely free from any taint of "dog-in-the-manger" selfishness. Uncle Sam stands rebuked and should hide his head in shame.

### Maryland Democrats

have realized, says the *Alexandria Gazette*, the great loss they sustained when Mr. Gorman was retired from the Senate and are striving to return him to that body. With his assistance they have wrong from the Maryland Legislature a new election law which has a Massachusetts model with South Carolina interpretations.

Mr. Gorman, says our Virginia contemporary, has a strong position as a Democratic leader. He has never bolted and never been a cuckoo. He helped to make Cleveland, but refused to bow to Cleveland as an autocrat. He opposed Bryan's nomination, but refused to bolt him or his silver issue in 1896. A year ago he said there would be no occasion for strife in either party at its conventions for 1900. Mr. Gorman has been a Democrat working in the harness always. He is also the ablest of the Democratic leaders and managers. If he returns to the Senate there will be no question of his leadership there. The South will find in him a strong supporter.

### Germany's Industrial Crisis—A Warning for America.

Consular reports have been recently describing the industrial situation in various parts of Germany as bad, and the *Berliner Tageblatt*, in a recent issue, confirms the depressing news. According to this paper, "the lot of the poorer population during the last few months has been very bitter. A long and hard winter, the high price of coal and the increasing want of work have created conditions against which all charitable efforts have been powerless. Living has become very difficult among masses of the people. The necessities of life have to be severely restricted. The savings of years are in great part consumed, and debts for rent and food have been made, the repayment of which will influence the well being of many families for a long time. Reduced protection and dismissal of work people are at present so general that they scarcely attract notice."

There is a disposition in some quarters to attribute this distress to the excessive size of the German army and the enormous burden imposed by the new effort to create a great German fleet. To be first on sea as well as on land is held to be an unreasonable ambition. At The Hague Conference, while opposing, on Germany's behalf, the reduction of armaments, Colonel Schwarzhoff, citing the prosperity of his country, contended that great military establishments tend to increase the national wealth. "The German people," he said, "are not crushed beneath a load of taxation. \* \* \* On the contrary, public and private wealth is increasing; the common well being, the standard of life, is rising from year to year. As for compulsory service, Germany does not regard it as a heavy burden, but as a sacred duty to which she owes her existence, her prosperity and her future." For a time, no doubt, large military expenditure produces a fictitious prosperity, but not a few Germans begin to say that the after effects are such as the country now witnesses. Militarism and aggressive imperialism at home and abroad, if not the entire cause, are at least partly the cause of Germany's present industrial crisis.

### Senator Tillman.

of South Carolina, colleague of Senator McLaurin, comments vigorously upon Mr. McLaurin's speech at Charlotte, N. C., in which Mr. McLaurin advised the Southern Democracy to break away from the old lines. Mr. Tillman says: "Senator McLaurin's speech is contradictory, full of paradoxes and seems intending to pave the way for the Senator's passage into the Republican camp. It may excite surprise outside of this State, but the only thing that astonishes us here is his continued effort to pose as a Democrat." The attempt to win the Southern Democracy over to the advocacy of protection could not have been undertaken at a more unpromising time. The drift of the Republican party itself is away from protection. The iron, cotton and oil-producing South needs the open rather than the shut door. Senator McLaurin has surely carried his high tariff eggs to the wrong market; his flop is foredoomed to failure. Republican leaders realize this, but at the same time it will take a great many McLaurins to convince them that the South is ripe for turning a political somersault.

### A "Barbarian" Tribute.

We have been a nation 125 years, lacking a little more than two months. Our States are joined together to "establish justice" and "insure domestic tranquility." For decades following our great civil war, the result of an "irrepressible conflict," we boasted increasingly of our leadership in peace over the whole world. We have put forth libraries of self-eulogy on our progress in peaceful industries and arts. We have gloried in our own way on the peace compelling influences of our public schools and churches. Where we sat at The Hague Peace Conference, there, in our not too modest view, was the head of the council table.

These conditions and others have not been without effect. We have drawn from the lips of Aguinaldo, late an enemy, these words of tribute:

How terrible are the Americans! They are splendid and ferocious fighters.

Thus the barbarism of the Far East bows to the civilization of the compelling Occident.

### Will Italy Change Her Foreign Policy.

The Paris newspapers, says the *New York Sun*, with scarcely an exception, now profess ardent friendship for Italy, and are disposed to argue that the visit of the Italian fleet to Toulon, like the visit of the French fleet to Kronstadt, will have far reaching political consequences. A Hungarian paper takes a similar view, and declares that the Triple Alliance will not be renewed in 1903, but that, on the contrary, Italy will become an ally of France and Russia. The presence of a Russian squadron at Toulon during the festivities in honor of the Italian visitors is thought to confirm the prediction. There is another and more probable theory, that Italy, while refraining from joining the Dual Alliance, will enter into a compact to maintain a strict neutrality in the event of a war between Germany and France.

The latter theory rests on the authority, such as it is, of the well known correspondent of the *London Times* in Paris. Mr. de Blowitz says that he has seen a letter from "a personage of high rank in one of the small northern powers," which letter contains an outline of an agreement alleged to be on the point of signature by Russia, France and Italy. According to this personage, the treaty is neither offensive nor defensive, but simply pledges Italy, as we have said, to remain a neutral. A moment's reflection will show that such neutrality would be of incomparably more benefit to France than to Germany. In the event of a war between the two last named powers, France would no longer be compelled to keep a considerable part of her army on her southeastern frontier to withstand a possible invasion in that quarter and she would also be able to employ the whole of her Mediterranean fleet for aggressive operations in the North Sea and the Baltic. Germany, on the other hand, could use only a part of her land-forces against France, because Russia would be able, not only to occupy Austria, but to menace Germany's eastern frontier.

It is clear, then, that such an agreement would be regarded at Berlin as a hostile act, and while Germany might not venture to punish Italy directly by an invasion, at the risk of precipitating a conflict with Russia and France, she might have recourse to the weapon which in 1881 Bismarck found effective for the purpose of driving Italy into a league with Germany and Austria. That weapon was an agitation in favor of an international guarantee of the independence of the Papacy, a guarantee which would have involved a revival of the Pope's sovereignty over some of the former Papal dominions. Such a restoration, if brought about by exterior pressure, would deal a more deadly blow at Italian unity than would the sometimes mooted voluntary cession of the Leonine City, together with a strip of land running from it to the sea. The situation, however, would be materially different from that of twenty years ago, for, if Italy could count upon the support of France and Russia, she should be able to resist any pressure exercised by Germany and Austria.

In the internal condition of Italy at the present time there are indications that a change of foreign policy might meet with favor. The young King Victor Emmanuel III. is believed to be strongly prepossessed in favor of France, and he has already evinced a determination to be much less of a figurehead in the Government than his father. It may be taken for granted that his Queen, who was a Montenegrin princess, would do anything in her power to further the most cordial relations between Russia and her adopted country. Then, again, in the Chamber of Deputies, the centre of political gravity seems likely to be fixed permanently in the Left, and the Left is not only notoriously anti-Teutonic, in its sympathies, but includes the Irredentists, who deem the unity of Italy incomplete so long as Austria is suffered to retain the Trentino and Trieste. Once more, in Lombardy the feeling of dislike for Austria and of gratitude to France is more pervasive and emphatic than in any other part of the Italian peninsula, and it so happens that in the present Ministry, both the Premier and the Minister for Foreign Affairs are natives of Lombardy.

So much for political tendencies; even stronger are the political motives for desiring cordial relations. Germany, which is an in-

tensely protectionist country, offers no prospect of an outlet for any important part of Italy's surplus products. Austria, never a highly valued customer, is of less consequence today than she was some years ago from the viewpoint of the Italian exporter. France used to afford by far the best market for Italian commodities, and, although the treaty of commerce concluded in 1898 was a disappointment, much better terms could be hoped for if France were entirely satisfied with Italy's political attitude. We may note, finally, that, in the eyes of far-sighted patriots like Sig. Sonning, a program of rigorous retrenchment is indispensable for the national welfare, and such a retrenchment would be practicable were Italy to bind herself to the maintenance of a strict neutrality, for then her standing army, the principal cause of her extravagance, might be significantly cut down.

Were Italy to proclaim neutrality in the event of a European war, France and Russia could annihilate Germany's sea power, and ought to prove much stronger on land than the united forces of Germany and Austria. Of course, the Berlin Government would sue for aid to England, but we do not think that the petition would be granted, in view of the straits to which the British Treasury has been reduced by the South African war.

### Ex Senator Hill on Trusts.

The Hon. David Bennett Hill made a speech before the Jefferson Club of Buffalo the other day which is full of good sense and sound doctrine. Referring to the continued formation of trusts and combines which dazzle by the boldness of their conception and the boundless extent of their proposed operations, Mr. Hill indulged in some speculations as to the attitude of Thomas Jefferson toward these great concerns if he were here to take part in public affairs today. Among other remedies which Jefferson might suggest, Mr. Hill said, would be that the Government, in justice to its overburdened taxpayers, should withdraw its tariff favors. "We may be sure," Mr. Hill added, "that he would not appoint to the office of Attorney General a man recommended by the promoters of these schemes, whose official province it would be to prosecute violators of the Federal statutes passed to prevent the consummation of such public wrongs."

It may be readily believed that Jefferson would never have consented to the protection of corporations in their extortions from the people by misusing the taxing power of the General Government. A corporation by the concentration of vast wealth gets possession of the home market and destroys all competition and then the power of the General Government is used to protect the monopoly from all other possible competition, viz., that of other countries. Jefferson would never have consented to any such arrangement as that.

### Another Impeccuous Prince.

Scarcely two months ago Duke Henry, who married the young Queen of Holland, had the good wishes of all mankind, on the principle that "all the world loves a lover." The honeymoon has not passed, however, before Benedict finds that life is not one grand, sweet song. Like most European princelets, Duke Henry is a slave to the money lenders, who are now clamoring for their gold. The Queen of Holland is a young lady of spirit and determination and evidently more practical than romantic. Her husband's creditors applied to her for payment of his debts, but she declined to advance the money, on the ground that Duke Henry's debts are a matter which concern him alone. Cupid has evidently not turned Wilhelm's head, and business before sentiment is her motto. The Duke's creditors have, it is reported, formed a syndicate and intend to offer his unpaid obligations for sale on the Amsterdam Stock Exchange. This is a severe revenge to take on a young man who is still "dreaming of love" and has not yet awakened to the bitter realities of life. There is no divinity which both hedge about an impeccuous princelet.

Duke Henry might have fared better if he had married an American heiress. Some of Columbia's daughters are so anxious to possess a title that they are willing to turn over their checkbooks and real estate to anybody who will lend them the poor distinction of an aristocratic name.

## FOREIGN NEWS.

Translated and Selected from leading  
European papers for the SENTINEL.

### ENGLAND.

#### A New Nihilistic Plot.

London Spectator.

Have the Nihilists decided on a new policy, that of attacking Ministers instead of the sovereign? The murder of the Russian Minister of Education, followed, as it has been, by the attempt to assassinate the Procurator of the Holy Synod, who is in Russia a great Minister, by the threatening letters to four other Ministers, and by the statement of the would be assassin Lagovsky that he was selected by lot for "the execution" out of a group of comrades, certainly suggest that idea to the historian of events. One can easily imagine reasons for such a change in the inner councils of the governing committees. They have as yet effected nothing by their crimes. Alexander II, it is true, was slain, but the only effect of that colossal act of ingratitude was that a Czar of singularly benevolent temper and much ability was succeeded by a Czar with far less benevolence, and a stronger determination to maintain the autocracy at all hazards. Alexander III, was almost a theocrat, for he held in apparent sincerity, that God could not have made such an inadequate person as himself Czar of Russia without intending to guide him. The present Emperor of Russia, though a gentle man is as completely master as Nicholas I. was, and the machine of government is as much a steam roller crushing all obstacles into one level of sand as it was before. The difficulties, too, of carrying on a kind of war with a succession of sovereigns are enormous. The reigning Czar is protected not only by guards and police, but by the loyal devotion of the people, and that kind of reverence even among those who threaten him, which, if all tales be true, has repeatedly broken the Nihilists' weapons in their hands. Three times at least we have seen it recorded that an assassin in two of the cases after reaching the presence of the Czar—has preferred suicide to the murder he had undertaken to commit. Such attempts, too, awaken a special horror which, however difficult to explain, is perfectly real, and which Nihilists, however callous they may be, cannot help feeling. They revive royalty rather than weaken it; and by interesting all Europe make the search for a safe asylum nearly hopeless. Ministers, however high their functions or successful their careers, are much less completely protected.

#### Pure Food Legislation.

London Saturday Review.

In the course of the [Pure Beer] debate and between the bouts of irrelevant humor a larger number of the supporters must have been logically converted, but it was difficult to go back on previous assurances, and in the relaxation of a facetious mood they were prompted to keep the subject alive a little longer. Almost all the specious arguments in favor of the bill were shattered. It would not benefit the farmers, as was demonstrated some weeks ago by a practical farmer and brewer, because the cheaper foreign barley which have more sunlight to ripen them are much richer in sugar than the English grain. It would not benefit the "public house beer drinkers" because the "part malt" beer would be sold at a much lower rate, and would be neither less pleasant nor in most cases less wholesome. The panic caused by the outbreak of arsenical poisoning, which contributed chiefly to the assent in favor of the bill, was altogether irrational. Like most popular cries the arguments founded on it were vitiated by a complete ignorance of the facts: poisoning by arsenic was a danger for which the bill did not even suggest any provision. There is no doubt immediate need for the law to take steps to prevent a repetition of such a disaster as has befallen beer drinkers in the Manchester district, but the natural and only effective method was to stiffen the Food and Drug Act. For fifty years beer has been brewed from sugar, for the reason that a certain proportion of sugar helped to make a cheaper and more wholesome drink than unqualified malt. Chemically beer is as pure when brewed from sugar as from malt, to the chemist the ultimate product is identical in the two cases. For the sake of the consumer it is merely necessary to see that the product of the malt, as of the sugar, is pure; for malt as well as sugar may contain arsenic.

#### Barmains Must Go.

London Hospital.

In our efforts to control intemperance we may either attack "the drink" itself, a crusade noble, possibly, but quixotic, or, with the Bishop of Winchester, we may adopt the humbler but more practical method of strengthening the powers of the law for the suppression of certain generally recognized evils connected with the trade in alcohol. Among those evils we do not place the barmain? That is a "charming creature" we are, of course, ready to admit, and that she is often an honest, hard working and much overworked woman we not only admit but know. But all the same she is responsible for much evil. No one who is compelled by unkind fate to live much away from home can help observing to how large an extent the barmain is responsible for the initiation of drinking habits among young men, and when one considers how many young fellows there are in all commercial towns who live away from home and hardly speak to any women except waitresses and barmains, we cannot wonder at it. Barmains are the syrens who lead the young to drink. Of this there can be no doubt, and the question is whether the purveyors of alcohol should be allowed to use up such a mass of maidenhood as is annually sacrificed to the trade, merely for the sake of giving additional attractiveness to the drink they sell. Barmains as a class are much to be pitied. They have to work hard, they have to stand long hours, and to suffer all the evils which long standing causes in women, while constantly before them are the bottles and the taps from which temporary comfort for these miseries can be obtained. Can we wonder that some give way to the temptation, and that the occupation of barmain is an unhealthy one? As to the morality of the work we will not say much. That many barmains are as good as most people goes without saying, as it also does that many, and especially the younger of them, are exposed from week end to week end to temptations to which no woman—or girl as she often is—ought to be exposed as part of her business life. No woman ought to be "put in the shop window," so to say, as part of the attraction of the shop, as is done practically with barmains. That the work of barmains is far more full of risks, and demands inspection far more than many an industry which is ticketed "dangerous," we are quite convinced; and when to that we add the danger to the public which accrues from the employment of, often, physically attractive women as lures to drinking, and as a means of encouraging drinking habits, we think we are on the right side in saying that if barmains cannot be at once abolished, a very heavy tax on their employment and a very careful inspection of the conditions under which they are employed would, to say the least, make for temperance.

#### Hard Worked Clerks.

London Pall Mall Gazette.

The other morning Signor Pinetti, Minister of Foreign Affairs, went, as usual, to the Quirinal for the Royal signature to various documents, which the King signed without comment until he arrived at one for the augmentation of the staff of the Foreign Office. "This," he said, to the surprise of the minister, "you may leave; I desire to look into it," and there the matter ended for the moment. The next morning his Majesty went out alone, and on foot, arriving at the Foreign Office about nine o'clock, and began a tour of inspection. "We may call it, in search of some one to speak to. At last in a small room towards the roof he came upon a man busily engaged in—rolling a cigarette. "Ah!" said the King, "you are already at work; pray what are the regulations morning hours in this office?" "From eight to twelve," stammered the unhappy man, wishing his bad luck had not come so early out of bed. "And what hour, may I ask, can I hope to see your colleague?" "About eleven," the embarrassed clerk replied, too confused not to tell the truth. "Oh! well, go on with your smoke and tell your chief of my visit when he comes," which, of course, was done, causing dismay to reign supreme in the breasts of the two odd clerks who caught napping. Meanwhile the Minister was called, and told dryly that instead of increasing the staff of the office, it might be just as well to see that those already there did their duty.

#### Students' Riots in Russia.

Vienna Politische Korrespondenz.

The reports of a revolutionary movement in Russia which have appeared abroad are much exaggerated; but there can be no doubt that the country is in a state of serious agitation, which seems to be spreading to wider circles. This outbreak is no surprise to the Government; on the contrary, it now appears that the police have for the last six months known of the existence of a secret league among the students' organizations, and that the students' organizations were called, and told dryly that instead of increasing the staff of the office, it might be just as well to see that those already there did their duty.

The reports of a revolutionary movement in Russia which have appeared abroad are much exaggerated; but there can be no doubt that the country is in a state of serious agitation, which seems to be spreading to wider circles. This outbreak is no surprise to the Government; on the contrary, it now appears that the police have for the last six months known of the existence of a secret league among the students' organizations, and that the students' organizations were called, and told dryly that instead of increasing the staff of the office, it might be just as well to see that those already there did their duty.

They also succeeded in discovering a secret congress of the students which had been summoned to Odessa. The delegates of the various universities were arrested and a considerable collection of forbidden works, revolutionary pamphlets, and documents relating to the plans and organization of the secret league were confiscated. Unfortunately, this success was much overrated, the police being of opinion that they had nipped the whole movement in the bud. However, on this occasion the students' organization was so powerful and so widespread that it was quite unshaken by the action of the authorities. One party in Government circles openly express their opinion that this high handed treatment of the former movement was an unpardonable mistake. They maintain that the attempt to stop the movement by the adoption of measures of great severity, although they had often before proved successful, was due to an insufficient comprehension of the facts. \* \* \*

Disturbances among students are common in Russia, and have been almost chronic since the 'eighties. In most cases they have not been of a nature to excite any anxiety, and they are as often as not merely youthful outbreaks, such as occur equally in the universities of other countries without any after effects. The attitude of the public on the present occasion is very significant. The Russian people have usually been indifferent to and ignorant of the objects of the students, sometimes even hostile to them. But the present outbreak, which was really a deliberately organized street riot, met with the approval of a large section of the population. The struggle between students and police and Cossacks has been attended by more bloodshed and more bitterness than usual, and the recent outrages have not alienated public sympathy from the students. These facts are sufficient to show the stage which the present movement has reached. Every observer must regard the situation as serious, and look forward with some apprehension to what the future may bring.